

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/867,589	05/31/2001	Lawrence Daniel Hogan	23952-0145	6560
72386 SUTHERLANI	7590 10/23/200 D H	7	EXAMINER	
SUTHERLAND, ASBILL & BRENNAN, LLC 999 PEACHTREE STREET			AKINTOLA, OLABODE	
ATLANTA, G			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
,			3691	
				-
•			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/23/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/867,589	HOGAN, LAWRENCE DANIEL	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Olabode Akintola	3691	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailine earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timwill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this com D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 A</u> 2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□ This 3)□ Since this application is in condition for allowa closed in accordance with the practice under B	s action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		merits is
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-16 and 18-30 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-16 and 18-30 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example.	epted or b) objected to by the I drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFF	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. Is have been received in Application Frity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National S	Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate	

Application/Control Number: 09/867,589

Art Unit: 3691

Detailed Action

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-16 and 18-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reader et al. (USPAP 20020143583) (hereinafter referred to as "Reader") in view of Lemay, "Teach Yourself Web Publishing with HTML 4 in a Week" (1997, Sam.net Publishing, Fourth Edition) (hereinafter referred to as "HTML").

Re claims 1, 9, 18, 23, 29, and 30: Reader teaches a method for presenting a bill and associated non-bill information via a network, comprising; transmitting to a payer, via a network, a bill including a first charge, a second charge, a location identifier of first non-bill information upon which the first charge is based, and a location identifier of second non-bill information

Art Unit: 3691

upon which the second charge is based (Fig. 3, RN {55, 58), section 0034); receiving from the payer, via the network, a request for at least one of the first non-bill information and the second non-bill information (abstract, sections 0021-0023, Fig. 3); and transmitting to the payer, via the network, the requested non-bill information in response to the received request (fig. 3, section 0034).

Reader does not explicitly teach location identifiers that index portions of documents. However, HTML teaches identifiers that index two separate documents as well as portions of the same documents using *anchors* (see pages 99-106). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Reader to include these features as taught by HTML. One would have been motivated to do so in order to link specific document or portions of a document to an identifier.

Re claims 2 and 10: Reader does not explicitly teach the first document comprising first non-bill information and the second document comprising second non-bill information are the same document. However, HTML teaches identifiers that index two separate documents as well as portions of the same documents using *anchors* (see pages 99-106). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Reader to include these features as taught by HTML. One would have been motivated to do so in order to link specific document or portions of a document to an identifier.

Application/Control Number: 09/867,589

Art Unit: 3691

Re claims **3**, **12**, **20**, and **25**: Reader teaches document is one of a contract, a tariff, or a warranty (section 0034).

Re claims **4** and **13**, Kitchen teaches location identifier of the first non-bill information includes a first hyper-link and the location identifier of the second non-bill information includes a second hyper-link, and further comprising: activating at least one of the first hyper-link and the second hyper-link to request non-bill information (fig. 3, RN {55}, section 0034)

Re claims **5**, **14**, and **26**: Reader teaches the bill, including the location identifier of the first non-bill information and the location identifier of the second non-bill information, is transmitted to the payer by a bill presentment server (fig. 1, RN {8}); and the non-bill information is transmitted to the payer by a non-bill presentment server (fig. 1, RN {3}, section 0023: "It is foreseen that the renewal server 8 could comprise multiple servers or computers").

Re claims **6**, **15**, **21**, and **27**: Reader teaches the bill presentment server is associated with a bill presentment service provider and the non-bill presentment server is associated with a biller (fig. 1, RN {2 (payer station), 8 (service provider station) and 3 (biller station)}, section 0023: "It is foreseen that the renewal server 8 could comprise **multiple servers** or computers").

Re claims 7, 11, 19, and 24: Reader teaches bill is one of a detailed bill or a summary bill (fig. 3)

Re claims **8**, **16**, **22**, and **28**: Reader teaches bill further includes a location identifier of non-bill information other than non-bill information upon which a charge is based (fig. 3, RN {62})

Art Unit: 3691

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

In response to applicant's argument that Reader teaches only a single server, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Reader recites at section 0023, "It is foreseen that the renewal server 8 could comprise multiple servers or computers".

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Olabode Akintola whose telephone number is 571-272-3629. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30AM -5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on 571-272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

OA

HANI M. KAZIMI PRIMARY EXAMINER